

# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/941,972	08/29/2001	Yoshihide Murakami	213338	7743
23460	7590 02/23/2005		EXAM	INER
	OIT & MAYER, LTD	REDDICK, MARIE L		
TWO PRUDENTIAL PLAZA, SUITE 4900 180 NORTH STETSON AVENUE			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
CHICAGO,	IL 60601-6780	1713		
				_

DATE MAILED: 02/23/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	09/941,972	MURAKAMI ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Judy M. Reddick	1713				
The MAILING DATE of this communicate Period for Reply	ion appears on the cover sheet wi	th the correspondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICA  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communica  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) da  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutor  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	TION. 'CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reation. ys, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty y period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON' by statute, cause the application to become AB	eply be timely filed  y (30) days will be considered timely.  THS from the mailing date of this communication.  IANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed or	n 22 November 2004.					
·						
,-	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
closed in accordance with the practice u						
Disposition of Claims						
4) Claim(s) <u>1,4,6-9,12 and 14-16</u> is/are per	nding in the application.					
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are w	rithdrawn from consideration.					
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.	•	•				
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1,4,6-9,12 and 14-16</u> is/are reje	Claim(s) <u>1,4,6-9,12 and 14-16</u> is/are rejected.					
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction	and/or election requirement.					
Application Papers						
9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Ex	raminer.					
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)[	☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to t	by the Examiner.				
Applicant may not request that any objection	to the drawing(s) be held in abeyan	ce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).				
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the						
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by	the Examiner. Note the attached	Office Action or form PTO-152.				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for f a) All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority doc	uments have been received.					
2. Certified copies of the priority doc		•				
<ol> <li>Copies of the certified copies of the application from the International I</li> </ol>	·	received in this National Stage				
* See the attached detailed Office action for		received.				
Attachment(s)	_					
I) ⊠ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) ☑ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-9		ummary (PTO-413) )/Mail Date				
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO	/SB/08) 5) 🔲 Notice of In	formal Patent Application (PTO-152)				
Paper No(s)/Mail Date	6) Other:	<u> </u>				

Art Unit: 1713

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

## Response to Amendment

1. The Amendment filed on 11/22/04 is sufficient to remove the rejection under 35 USC § 102 (b)/103 (a) over Otsuka et al (U.S. 4,608,249) as applied to claims 1 & 9 (08/16/04, paragraph no. 4) and the rejection under 35 USC 103 (a) over Otsuka et al (U.S. 4,608,249) in combination with Muraoka et al (U.S. 5,876,745) or Muraoka et al (U.S. 6,139,867) as applied to claims 2-8 & 10-16.

#### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

- 2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:
  - The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
- 3. Claims 6 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The recited "glycerine ester of saturated fatty acid" per claims 6 & 14 constitutes indefinite subject matter as per the non-express establishment of proper antecedent basis. It is suggested that applicant replace "glycerine" with "triglycerine" so as to avoid any confusion.

#### **Double Patenting**

4. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See In re Goodman, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); In re Longi, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); In re Van Ornum, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); In re Vogel, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, In re Thorington, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

5. Claims 1, 4, 6-9, 12 & 14-16 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1 & 10-14 of U.S. Patent No. 6,787,681 B2. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the adhesive layer mainly comprised of an acrylic polymer, a component compatible with the acrylic polymer and liquid or pasty at ordinary

Art Unit: 1713

trilaurate, glyceryl triisostearate and glyceryl trioleate and a chemical crosslinking agent such as an isocyanate compound and an organic peroxide per the claims of U.S. Patent '681 overlaps in scope with the adhesive composition for application to skin which comprises an acrylic copolymer(100 parts by weight) obtained from a monomer mixture comprising a (meth)acrylic acid alkyl ester monomer(40 to 80 wt %), an alkoxy group-containing ethylenically unsaturated monomer(10 to 60 wt %) and a carboxy group-containing ethylenically unsaturated monomer(1 to 10 wt %) and a triglycerine ester of a saturated fatty acid having 8 to 10 carbon atoms (20 to 120 parts by weight) which is liquid or paste at room temperature, wherein the acrylic copolymer has a gel fraction of 30 to 80 wt % per the instantly claimed invention with the understanding that the acrylic copolymer of U.S. Patent '681 meets the acrylic copolymer of the instantly claimed invention as expressly taught at col. 4, lines 58-67, col. 5, lines 1-19 & 38-67 and col. 6, lines 1-3 of U.S. Patent '681. Furthermore, the contents of the acrylic copolymer and the monomer components making up the acrylic copolymer per U.S. Patent '681 are generic and therefore necessarily imply that any content, including the claimed contents, would have been operable within the scope of the claimed invention. As to the gel content, such would be considered to be an inherent property of the acrylic copolymer of the claims of U.S. Patent '681, as modified or not to involve anything unobvious.

Claims 1, 4, 6-9, 12 & 14-16 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 4, 5 & 10 of copending Application No. 10/443,844.

Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the adhesive layer formed from a resin composition comprising an acrylic acid ester polymer, a carboxylic acid ester having 16 or more carbon atoms which is compatible with said acrylic acid ester polymer and is liquid or paste at ordinary temperature and a crosslinking agent per the claims of copending application '844 over laps in scope with the adhesive composition for application to skin which comprises an acrylic copolymer(100 parts by weight) obtained from a monomer mixture comprising a (meth)acrylic acid alkyl ester monomer(40 to 80 wt %), an alkoxy group-containing ethylenically unsaturated monomer(10 to 60 wt %) and a carboxy group-containing ethylenically unsaturated monomer(1 to 10 wt %), a triglycerine ester of a saturated fatty acid having 8 to 10 carbon atoms (20 to 120 parts by weight) which is liquid or paste at room temperature, wherein the acrylic copolymer has a gel fraction of 30 to 80 wt % per the instantly claimed invention with the understanding that the acrylic copolymer and

carboxylic acid ester having 16 or more carbon atoms of copending application '844 meet the acrylic copolymer and triglycerine ester of the instantly claimed invention as expressly taught at pages 11 & 12 and page 14, lines 6-22, respectively, of copending application '844. Furthermore, the contents of the acrylic copolymer and the monomer components making up the acrylic copolymer per copending application '844 are generic and therefore necessarily imply that any content, including the claimed contents, would have been operable within the scope of the claimed invention. As to the gel content, such would be considered to be an inherent property of the acrylic copolymer of the claims of copending application '844, as modified or not to involve anything unobvious.

This is a <u>provisional</u> obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

### Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments filed 11/22/04 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.
Relative to the OTDP Rejection----The Obviousness-type double patenting rejection of claims 1,4, 6-9, 12
& 14-16 over claims 1 & 10-14 of U.S. Patent 6,787,681 B2 (U.S. copending 10/317,076) set forth supra is deemed proper, herein maintained and necessitates an acceptably filed Terminal Disclaimer so as to remove this rejection.

#### Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Judy M. Reddick whose telephone number is (571) 272-1110. The examiner can normally be reached on 6:00 a.m. - 2:30 p.m.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Wu can be reached on (571) 272-1114. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Application/Control Number: 09/941,972 Page 5

Art Unit: 1713

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Judy M. Redduck Primary Examiner Art Unit 1713

JMR Jme. 02/21/05